

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 10-28, and 30-45 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 10-28, and 30-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious from Knee et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,589,892 ("Knee") in view of West et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,550,575 ("West").

Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended claims 1, 27, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, and 39 to more particularly define the claimed invention. The amendments do not add any new matter and are fully supported by the originally-filed application.

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' Reply

Claims 1, 10-28, and 30-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious from Knee and West. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Knee and West, whether taken alone or in combination, do not show or suggest receiving an unblocking criterion at the viewer input device for unblocking a television program, that meets the blocking criterion, based on the content of the television program without uniquely identifying the television program such that the user is permitted to access the blocked program without providing the password, as defined by applicants' amended independent claim 1. The Examiner acknowledges that Knee is silent regarding this feature (see, Office Action pages 3 and 6) and relies on West to remedy this deficiency. However, West discusses allowing users to block a program by blocking the

related channel from viewing during specified times and allowing users to eliminate censorship from a program to enable their viewing in a similar fashion, *i.e.*, by entering the channel information corresponding to the program at a particular time and day of the week into an exceptions list. In particular, West is silent on an unblocking criterion based on program content and which also does not uniquely identify the television program. Moreover, eliminating censorship from a program by requiring that a channel not be blocked at a specified time via an exceptions list is equivalent to requiring information that uniquely identifies the program. In contrast, applicants' claims require an unblocking criterion that does not uniquely identify the television program and is based on program content. Therefore, West does not make up for the deficiencies of Knee relative to the rejection.

Accordingly, Knee and West, whether taken alone or in combination, do not show or suggest every element of applicants' independent claim 1.

Independent claims 27, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, and 39 are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 27, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, and 39 and claims 10-26, 28, 30, 32, 35, 37, and 40-45 which depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, 27, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, or 39 are allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, claims 1, 10-28, and 30-45 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gall C. Gotfried/

Gall C. Gotfried
Reg. No. 58,333
Attorney for Applicants
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 75563
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8704
Tel.: (212) 596-9000